



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/697,814	10/29/2003	Shawn Sato	075834.00449	9555
33448	T500	05/23/2004		EXAMINER
ROBERT J. DEPKE LEWIS T. STEADMAN			VALENTINE, DONALD R.	
HOLLAND & KNIGHT LLC				
131 SOUTH DEARBORN			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
30TH FLOOR			1742	
CHICAGO, IL 60603			DATE MAILED: 05/27/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.	Applicant(s)
10/697,814	SATO ET AL
Examiner	Art Unit
Donald R. Valentine	1742

— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

### A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(e). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than these months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may refuse any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 13-35 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 13 and 18 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 14-17 and 19-35 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    - 2) Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 09/963,986.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. Claims 13 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhou et al.

Zhou et al (6,402,931) show apparatus comprising processing solution supplying means (218) for supplying a processing solution over a surface to be polished at least substantially parallel to the surface, (see Fig. 2, 3B and 11; col. 8, lines 24-35; and col. 15, lines 35-44), and is shown to be useful for machining (polishing) passive oxide films on a workpiece surface (see col. 9, lines 60-65).

The reference appears to demonstrate the conventional cathode-anode relationship found in electropolishing, i.e., workpiece being anodic and tool being cathodic. (Claim 18).

The reference does not specifically recite preferentially removing projecting film by the shear stress of the processing solution".

It would be considered within the skill of the art to removing any projecting film (on the protuberances of the workpiece surface) by polishing action being the result of "shear stress" from the electrolyte directed at the workpiece surface because the reference operates to remove protuberances which are considered an obvious form of "projection portions" which removal would operate to "flatten" the workpiece surface. (Col. 9, lines 15-17).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:  

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
5. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
6. Claim 13 recites the limitation "the film formed outside of the interconnection grooves by a shear stress" in lines 6-7. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

7. Claims 14-17 and 19-35 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
8. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The references of record do not show or suggest polishing apparatus which has a cathode member arranged to face a surface having a film on the surface to be polished, means to supply processing solution over the surface to be polished at least substantially parallel to the surface and removing preferentially projecting portions of the surface film by the shear stress of the processing solution, a power supply for supplying voltage to the cathode and the film as an anode, and wherein the film comprises a copper film.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Donald R. Valentine whose telephone number is 571-272-1250. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King can be reached on 571-272-1244. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 1742

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Donald R. Valentine  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1742

drv  
May 25, 2004